DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 527 CE 028 378

TITLE	ISSOE: Managing Student Progress. Field Test. Phase 1, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Development in Occupational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Div. of Occupational Education Supervision.
PUB DATE	Dec 80
GRANT	80-3A-1114-GS
NOTE	90p.; For related documents see CE 028 346.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Competency Based Education; Educational Research; *Field Tests; Individualized Instruction; *Management Information Systems; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; *Systems Approach; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Instructional Support System Occupational Educ

ABSTRACT

During the last five years, the Instructional Support System for Occupational Education (ISSOE) in New York State has grown to involve approximately 3,000 teachers in development activities. To manage this system, a management information system was set up to develop reports on student progress, student decision making, and planning for student programs. Guides for teachers and administrators were prepared for each of these areas, as well as a guide providing an overall view of the system. A field test was conducted for six months in order to see how well the various components of the system were functioning. The majority of the field test was evaluated by descriptive comments and talks with teachers and administrators in the field. In addition, student questionnaires were administered. In general, results of the field test showed that the system was working well, and all who were involved with it felt that it was a positive effort. Five recommendations, mostly having to do with expanding capabilities of assessment through computerization, were made. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199527

Field Test

Phase 1, Final Report

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. A. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 028 378

Research Pub. 80-11
December, 1980

PROJECT STAFF

Robert Frank

Dennis Ridley

Mary Margaret Carmichael

John Bowers

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

James Dunn

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The production of this final report represents a major milestone in New York State's Occupational Education program. Various agencies in the state have participated in the development of materials for ISSOE. This project sought to bring those pieces together and test them in a coordinated field situation.

Recognizing credit for such an endeavor is a difficult task since so many people were involved. Special thanks, however, must be extended to those Directors of Occupational Education, ISSOE Regional Coordinators and Area Facilitators, classroom teachers and school administrators, without whose assistance and cooperation such an undertaking never could have occurred.

Thanks also are due to Dr. John Bowers, Research Associate at CIOE, who provided the verification of utility questionnaires for the study, and Dr. Dennis Ridley, another Institute Research Associate, who assisted in site visits and test plan development.

Likewise, appreciation must be given to Madeline Dean, Lois Snyder, Elaine LaRocque, Cindy Moore and Judith Nichols, Secretaries, for their willingness to assume extra responsibilities related to the field test, the user's guide and this final report. Thanks must also be given to Lynn Rycroft for her cooperation in fiscal management of this project.

Finally, deep appreciation must be extended to Dr. Robert Frank, Institute Coordinator of ISSOE Projects, for his efforts in daily management of the field test and the preparation of this report. His careful attention to field test details, and his willingness to work long and hard to ensure the success of this project are worthy of special note.

James A. Dunn
Institute Director and
Principal Investigator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I	INTRODUCTION	1
PART II	PROJECT ACTIVITIES	3
PART III	PROJECT EVALUATION	45
PART IV	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	47
PART V	APPENDICES	49

PART I
INTRODUCTION

In the last five years, ISSOE has grown from a summer workshop for 29 teachers to a statewide effort involving all geographic regions of the state and 25 occupational education areas. In 1979, approximately 3,000 teachers were involved in ISSOE development activities.

Such a system requires a systematic, comprehensive, but flexible, management information system for effective control. ISSOE/VTECS curriculum materials identified specific competencies that need to be taught in various occupational education programs. The particular competencies a student actually develops, however, are, of course, a function of local program availabilities, instructor planning effort, and student interests, abilities and career goals.

A competency based vocational education program requires a system for: planning student programs; monitoring student achievement; and reporting student progress. Systematic information must be provided to: teachers for instructional management decisions; administrators for coordination and evaluation of programs; home schools for accountability; students and parents for progress monitoring purposes; and, of course, to employers for employee selection purposes.

This aspect of the ISSOE effort was concerned with the development of prototype procedures for developing student learning programs, reporting student progress and developing student

employability profiles. A field test was completed to examine the planning and reporting system in a comprehensive fashion and in a variety of settings. The goal was to ascertain ISSOE support material adaptability to local school requirements, while developing the experience in a variety of program configurations.

This report reviews the activities of the Managing Student Learning: ISSOE Student Planning and Reporting System, Phase I -Field Test Project. The major findings of the project are summarized and possible dissemination and implementation activities are recommended.

The following chapter outlines the objectives set for the successful development of ISSOE systems. All phases involved are explained: planning, implementation, preparation of teaching guides, evaluation, dissemination of information, and expansion of competency options. Developmental stages are clarified by an extract from a journal of project activities. Finally, student and teacher reactions are recorded with the inclusion of questionnaires. This last step measures the utility of the decision making assistance in planning for future courses and eventual careers.

PART II
PROJECT ACTIVITIES

There were six main objectives of this effort. They were:

1. to coordinate activities with the Onondaga-Madison BOCES to assure compatibility of the student planning and reporting system with OERS data processing capability;
2. to meet periodically with statewide advisory and executive committees;
3. to prepare handbooks necessary for the implementation of the student planning and reporting system;
4. to test the adaptability of the student planning and reporting system to different local needs with different data processing procedures;
5. to disseminate information on the student planning and reporting system through meetings, conferences and presentations with Regional Coordinators, Area Facilitators, SED staff and other personnel as appropriate;
6. to prepare for the expansion of the reporting system by developing additional lists of competencies necessary for entry-level job titles.

Each of the six objectives have been achieved in this phase of the project.

Institute collaboration with other projects included presentations by staff at regional ISSOE meetings, and contacts with many Regional Coordinators, Area Facilitators and State Education Department personnel. These activities began when the project proposal was being drafted and continued throughout the year.

The three ISSOE projects funded at CIOE have enjoyed close articulation and collaboration. This occurred primarily through the direction of the Institute Coordinator for ISSOE Projects. This person has been responsible for assuring that all ISSOE projects are articulated and coordinated, when appropriate, and has been responsible for assuring that all project deliverables have been prepared on schedule.

Coordination Activities with Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS

Initial planning activities for the articulation and coordination with the Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS personnel began several months before this project was approved. A planning session was held in Albany, New York on October 17, 1979 consisting of representatives from Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS, SED persons familiar with ISSOE, and CIOE/ISSOE research staff. The purpose of that meeting was to outline the role which the Onondaga Regional Computer Center would play in the CIOE/ISSOE field test. Based upon the results of that session, initial strategies were developed for those field test sites that might have computer support. At that time, only the Syracuse and Rochester sites were included.

Subsequent to that meeting, a planning session was held between CIOE/ISSOE staff and Onondaga staff on December 5, 1979. At that meeting, discussions centered on the prototype reporting and planning forms which had been developed by CIOE. Also, at that session, CIOE staff gave copies of, and explained completely, all of the ISSOE field test plans and forms to date.

In early January, 1980, initial funding for the field test was received by CIOE. It was felt that another planning session should be arranged to allow finalization of plans regarding each site. A meeting was held on January 29, 1980 to discuss ISSOE in general and

the field test in specific. That meeting was attended by appropriate CIOE/ISSOE staff, appropriate SED/ISSOE staff, and the three ISSOE Area Facilitators. A copy of that meeting's minutes are attached to this report (see Appendix A). At that session, Onondaga-Madison indicated they had no plans for being involved in the CIOE/ISSOE field test this year.

Subsequent to that meeting, a planning session was held on April 24 at CIOE to discuss Onondaga's roles in Phase I and Phase II field test activities. At that meeting Onondaga again made it clear that they did not wish to take active participation in the field test this spring, but would like to be provided with copies of the data which are manually gathered by CIOE. A summary of meeting results is attached to this report as Appendix B.

After Onondaga withdrew participation, CIOE research staff made final arrangements with the Rochester site for the field test. Although Onondaga did not desire to participate in the field test this year, they were kept informed via CIOE/ISSOE monthly reports, of progress related to ISSOE projects.

Another meeting was held between CIOE/ISSOE staff and Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS staff on May 19, 1980, to discuss issues raised in a letter from Onondaga to the State Education Department. The issues in question were resolved at that meeting and, at the same time, CIOE staff provided direct input to Onondaga regarding specific problems, or changes that were needed, relating to the sixteen profiles which Onondaga was designing for ISSOE.

A final meeting was held June 5, 1980 between Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS persons, CIOE/ISSOE research staff and appropriate SED persons to evaluate the present state of both Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS and CIOE as related to ISSOE.

Each of these meetings has provided a forum for articulation and coordination of ISSOE projects. In spite of Onondaga's inability to participate in this phase of the field test, their input to CIOE has been both valuable and constructive.

Advisory/Executive Committee Meetings

When the CIOE/ISSOE field test proposal was being drafted, the State Education Department intended for a Statewide ISSOE Advisory Committee to be formed during the term of the project. It was felt that an Advisory Committee should be composed of various persons representing differing levels of involvement with occupational education. These could include district superintendents, ISSOE Area Facilitators and/or Regional Coordinators, ISSOE researchers, State Education Department persons, employers, placement coordinators, etc. It was felt that subordinate Executive Committees might be formed to carry out the mandates of the Advisory Committee.

On January 29, 1980 the first of these "Executive Committee" meetings was held in Ithaca, New York. That meeting was attended by CIOE/ISSOE research staff, Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS, the three ISSOE Area Facilitators and representatives of the New York State Education Department. The agenda of that meeting involved a general discussion of ISSOE, a discussion of the Onondaga Regional Computer Center's involvement with the CIOE/ISSOE field test, and CIOE/ISSOE research projects. The meeting proved valuable in that all participants were equally informed of the status of all ISSOE projects at the same time. At that meeting it was made clear, that this committee was not to have decision making powers but was to be a "working committee".

Subsequent to that meeting, a reorganization occurred within the New York State Education Department and activity of the committee was temporarily suspended. Although there had been some interest expressed by researchers, teachers, State Education Department employees and others that an Advisory Committee be convened, no further committee action has taken place.

In the late summer and early fall, 1980, a request was made by members of the SED/ISSOE Unit that the remaining funds from the Statewide Adivsory Committee be rechannelled into the preparation of a report dealing with the status of the major instructional systems which had been developed in the United States during the fifteen previous years. CIOE/ISSOE staff agreed with the ISSOE Unit that an analysis of such systems could provide valuable information to persons involved with the planning and management of ISSOE for the state. Therefore, during the fall a prospectus was prepared and distributed to SED outlining the purpose and scope of the "systems study." The preparation of this prospetus and the initial information collection on the systems which would be analyzed expended the resources which previously had been committed to the Statewide ISSOE Advisory Committee. This report is scheduled for delivery by the end of this year.

Preparation of Implementation Handbooks

For several months prior to the implementation of the field test, CIOE/ISSOE research staff conducted analyses to determine what information would be necessary for successful use of field test materials. It was deemed that a series of handbooks or user's guides should be created to assist teachers in the implementation of ISSOE. Accordingly, five user's guides were developed. They are:

1. Systems Overview
2. Student Decision Making
3. Planning Student Programs
4. Reporting Student Progress
5. Developing Student Profiles.

Each user's guide contains discrete information relevant to various aspects of the field test and ISSOE. The following brief description outlines the characteristics of each user's guide.

1. Systems Overview - This booklet describes briefly the developmental nature of ISSOE, and the roles and linkages which some of the major participants have in the ISSOE infrastructure. It outlines the interrelationships between key players and the philosophical foundation upon which ISSOE is based.

2. Student Decision Making - It was felt that teachers may wish to assist their students in career planning and career decision making. Accordingly, this guide was prepared. The first section of the guide deals with the need for assisting students in career decision making. It also explains to the teacher or administrator where, in the ISSOE system of planning

administrator where, in the ISSOE system of planning for individual students decision making could, and should, occur. The booklet then describes a variety of career decision making strategies, ranging from simple paper and pencil tests to sophisticated, articulated K-12 career development programs.

3. Planning Student Programs - Individualization of instruction is one of the major concerns of occupational education teachers. Repeatedly, CIOE/ISSOE research staff were confronted by demands from the field for assistance in individualizing vocational education programs. The CIOE/ISSOE research staff whose specialization includes the areas of curriculum, instruction and individualization, have been barraged by requests from the field for assistance in this area. Accordingly, in order to accommodate that need, the guide, "Planning Student Programs" was developed. The first 29 pages of the booklet concern philosophical tenets upon which individualization is based, dealing with issues such as the need for behavioral objectives, criterion-referenced measures, appropriately sequenced material, and learning style. The last section of the booklet shows, in a manner similar to the decision making booklet, how teachers can individualize competency based programs using CIOE support materials. The booklet vividly details various options for individualizing occupational education programs.

4. Reporting Student Progress - Another concern of vocational teachers is evaluation of student progress. Not only must the teachers evaluate students who are in

a competency-based instructional program, but they must develop techniques to report progress to appropriate persons, whether they be school administrators, students or their parents. This booklet, then, became a "cookbook" to assist teachers in completing the various reporting options which CIOE had created. The guide is not based upon any particular theoretical foundation, but simply shows the alternatives which were being field tested for reporting progress as pupils move through competency-based instruction.

5. Developing Student Profiles - As is done in Guide 4, this guide simply explains to teachers how to complete the employability profiles which CIOE has developed for the field test. This guide also is not based upon a particular theoretical foundation, but is based upon information requested by teachers, placement coordinators, administrators, and employers. Thus, it becomes a "cookbook" for developing a profile which reflects students' competencies.

Although the field test requested teachers to evaluate the booklets, the success of the booklets has not been fully ascertained. Only a small number actually felt the need to read the booklets. Most report using parts of the guides, however, and finding them helpful. And, CIOE has had many requests from the field for copies of these user's guides.

Based upon a decision made by the New York State Education Department, these user's guides were distributed only to a few State Education Department persons, the Regional Coordinators who participated in the field test, the three Area Facilitators and field test teachers.

The Field Test

The field test was conceived to assess the adaptability of the various options for planning student programs and reporting student progress which had been developed by CIOE. Prior to the drafting of the field test proposal it was determined, in consultation with SED persons, that the field test should not aim to involve only those persons and sites most familiar with ISSOE. Instead, it was designed to also involve sites that would lend to maximization of variability. Specifically, it was felt that rural, urban and suburban field test sites should be chosen. It was then determined that those sites selected (A) would be ones within a 150 mile radius of CIOE, so as to maximize the effectiveness of Institute staff for assisting teachers; (B) should be sites which have maximum support from the appropriate Directors of Occupational Education and Regional Coordinators; and (C) should be sites which would have maximum support from teachers within the program areas. Accordingly, five field test sites were initially selected.

It was decided that in early February, at the Directors of Occupational Education Conference, CIOE research staff would make contacts with the Directors of the targeted field test sites. It was assumed that the ISSOE Area Facilitators would make initial contacts with the Directors prior to the Feburary contacts by CIOE.

At the Directors' Conference four of the five Directors voiced strong support for participation in the field test. The fifth, who had not yet been contacted by his Area Facilitator, and was thus caught "off guard," requested not to participate in the field test this year. Based upon the feedback provided by the Directors at the conference, CIOE staff began to develop individual site plans outlining the strategy to be used for implementation of each field

test site. This obviously involved close discussions between CIOE and Onondaga-Madison BOCES/OERS personnel as identified previously in Objective 1.

The opening and closing of each field test site resulted in the establishment of a six step process identified by CIOE/ISSOE staff. These six steps were:

1. Orientation
2. Recruitment
3. Confirmation
4. Implementation
5. Integration
6. Termination

The following description outlines each of the steps, identifies the persons involved in that step, and states the results of that particular step.

1. Orientation - This step usually involved the CIOE Institute Director and the Institute Coordinator for ISSOE Projects traveling to each field test site, to meet with the Director of Occupational Education and the ISSOE Regional Coordinator. The sessions generally took one to two hours at each site. They essentially consisted of Institute staff explaining the rationale, goals and objectives, population and requirements which would be placed upon field test participants, whether they be administrators, teachers or students. At that same session, input was solicited from site personnel (i.e., Director of Occupational Education, Regional Coordinator, etc.) regarding characteristics which might be unique to that site. These characteristics could include the use of gifted students, computer assistance, or other variables.

2. Recruitment - After the orientation meeting, a session was held with the teachers who would participate in the field test. This session was arranged through the Regional Coordinator for that particular site and occasionally included other persons interested in ISSOE, such as local administrators, other ISSOE teachers, and administrators from the same region as the field test participants. At this session Institute staff presented information explaining the nature of the field test, its goals and objectives, and the requirements to be placed upon the teachers, should they elect to participate. Copies of the five field test user's guides and applicable forms for that field test site were distributed to field test participants and the Regional Coordinator. Institute staff explained CIOE's role in the field test and requested cooperation from the teachers. At very few of the test sites was it felt, by CIOE staff, that the potential field test participants were ready to make a commitment to the test. It was deemed most appropriate that these potential participants be allowed to take the materials, look them over and make a determination as to (A) whether or not they would like to participate in the field test; (B) which forms they might desire to use; and (C) the amount of technical assistance which they would require.

3. Confirmation - Approximately one week after the recruitment session, Institute staff returned to the test site and met with the potential teacher participants and Regional Coordinator. The purpose of this session was to have the teachers confirm their commitment to the field test. At this session, generally lasting one to two hours, the teachers would

identify which forms they would like to use, the date upon which they would like to begin the field test, and the amount and types of inservice assistance which they would require.

4. Implementation - The implementation phase involved Institute staff visiting the school or BOCES and working with the teachers to establish the field test plan. This primarily involved Institute staff assisting the teachers in preparation of IEPs for each student. Staff time varied from as little as one hour per teacher to the maximum of two days for one teacher. Extensive variability in implementation characteristics and requirements for each site was ascertained in this step. Some teachers simply identified a particular IEP option which they would like to use, and implemented the IEP in their classes with minimal CIOE assistance. Other teachers required the administration of an IEP to each student and then the selection of field test students from the total population.

5. Integration - The integration step involved CIOE staff visiting each site approximately once per week to "iron out" individual problems that had arisen since implementation. This involved assisting teachers in updating of wall charts and IEP folders; the preparation of Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profiles; and the analysis of each site's unique characteristics. The bulk of the field test activities after implementation were related to the integration phase.

6. Termination - This step involved Institute staff traveling to each site for collection of final data on each student's progress. At some sites, this also involved the preparation of a terminal Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile (RAOPP) for each student, and the distribution and explanation of the RAOPP to individual participants. Again, tremendous variability was observed between sites and between termination requirements for each site.

It should be noted that although six general steps have been outlined, there was variability between each site relating to the amount of assistance required at each step for each site. The following list might best aid the reader's understanding of the involvement of each individual field test site.

LIST 1

FIELD TEST SEQUENCE

February 22, 1980:

Institute staff met with the Director of Occupational Education at the Steuben-Alleghany BOCES. Subsequent to that session, Institute staff met with the Director of Occupational Education, the Assistant Director of Occupational Education and the Regional Coordinator at the Broome-Tioga BOCES. The business office education teacher who would participate in the program was invited to attend the session and she also received a brief orientation to the field test. For both of these sites, this session completed the orientation phase.

February 28, 1980:

Institute staff met with the Director of Occupational Education, a high school administrator, the coordinator

of the business office program for the Syracuse City Schools, and the ISSOE Regional Coordinator for the Syracuse area. This session was an orientation session for the Syracuse area sites.

March 6, 1980:

Institute staff made a presentation to the business office teachers from the Syracuse City School district who might participate in the field test. This meeting was attended by the coordinator of the business office program and the ISSOE Regional Coordinator for that area. This was a recruitment session.

March 13, 1980:

A confirmation/implementation session was held with one of the business office teachers from the Syracuse City Schools. That teacher was involved only with instructing pupils with special education needs; she felt she would need minimal assistance from CIOE staff on preparation of IEPs. Also at that time, she indicated a need for lower level D.O.T. job titles and descriptions than were being used for the field test.

March 17, 1980:

A recruitment session was held with automotive teachers and the Regional Coordinator from the Coopers Career Center/Steuben-Alleghany BOCES. At that meeting, the teachers requested that Institute staff call back on March 24 to set up a confirmation planning session.

LIST 1 - contd.

March 18, 1980:

Institute staff spend the entire day working with a business office teacher from the Syracuse City Schools concerning implementation of the field test for her classroom. The teacher indicated that she did not teach nine of the competencies required of the ISSOE catalog, and would need assistance in instructing competencies to her pupils.

March 21, 1980:

Institute staff met with the business office teacher at the Broome-Tioga BOCES and with the Regional Coordinator for that site. The teacher was provided with all the forms which she needed for the field test; she indicated that she would complete them on her own and would need virtually no assistance from the Institute staff. She requested that Institute staff call her on March 26 to see if she was having any problems relating to the field test.

March 22, 1980:

Institute staff met with a third teacher from the Syracuse City Schools who was an instructor in the business office program. This session was a confirmation session. The teacher requested to begin the field test on May 5. Following that session, a fourth business office teacher from the Syracuse City Schools met with CIOE staff and the Regional Coordinator. She also requested that the field test begin at her site on May 5, 1980.

March 24, 1980:

Institute staff called the teachers at the Coopers Career Center. A meeting for implementation was set for April 7.

March 26, 1980:

Institute staff contacted the business office teacher at the Broome-Tioga BOCES and found that everything was going fine with her field test. She elected to use IEP Form 1-C and requested that additional forms be sent to her. She was planning on involving approximately 50 students in the field test.

April 7, 1980:

Institute staff spent the entire day the Coopers Career Center/Steuben-Alleghany BOCES assisting teachers and students in completing the IEPs and updating previously prepared IEPS to reflect student training to date. Institute staff then prepared wall charts for all the students involved in the field test. This site involved approximately 60 students, 20 of whom were seniors and would be graduating in June; the remaining 40 were juniors and therefore potential carry-overs into the 1980-81 school year.

April 15, 1980:

Institute staff returned to Coopers Career Center and presented the teachers with wall charts for each of their classes. Institute staff then updated each student's IEP and the wall charts so the charts would reflect training which the

students had received from April 15-22. At that time, the teachers indicated that the method used to ascertain students' progress to date was inappropriate and inaccurate. (The students were asked what they had learned, and this was accepted at face value.)

April 28, 1980:

Institute staff returned to the Coopers Career Center with updated wall charts and explained these to the teachers and students. Following that meeting, Institute staff went to the Broome-Tioga BOCES to "check" that site. Although that teacher was absent, the Regional Coordinator was available and he indicated that all was going well with the field test. Institute staff also met with the Director of Occupational Education for the site, and he too indicated that the field test was progressing smoothly.

May 5, 1980:

Institute staff visited with the Syracuse City School field test participants. Those who had been implemented previously were now fairly well integrated. Two new teachers were implemented into the field test on that day. Both teachers indicated that they prepare students for D.O.T. job titles not included in the field test.

May 7, 1980:

Institute staff visited the Regional Coordinator for the Rochester City Schools and gave him copies of the user's guides and all the forms which would be used in the field test. The Regional Coordinator and CIOE staff then met with the

potential field test teachers from Edison Vocational-Technical Education Center. That recruitment session was attended by several school administrators, ISSOE Team Leaders and assistant principals from some of the surrounding occupational education centers. The teachers indicated that they prepare students for D.O.T. job titles not included in the field test list.

May 8, 1980:

A site visit was made to all the Syracuse City School sites. All sites were integrated and progressing fine at that time.

May 12, 1980:

A site visit was made to Coopers Career Center/Steuben-Alleghany BOCES. At that time the teachers indicated some additional misgivings about the Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile. They stated that the terms used to refer to proficiency levels were probably inadequate, and that the forms should be stamped as an "Unofficial Record." After that meeting, Institute staff visited the Broome-Tioga BOCES and found that the teacher had fully integrated the field test; she had prepared Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profiles for each of her students without any Institute assistance.

May 13-14, 1980:

Institute staff spent both days with teachers at the Edison Vocational-Technical Education Center in Rochester. The afternoon of May 13 was spent assisting almost thirty

students in four different automotive training classes in completing the SPPI portion of the IEP (Form 1B). On May 14 the SPPI portion of the IEP (Form 1B) was completed for the morning students in two additional classes. The total number of students participating in the field test at Edison Vocation-Technical Education Center was approximately 50. Also, on May 13, 1980, Institute staff gave a presentation related to the field test to automotive teachers at the L.B. Foreman Occupational Education Center in Fairport, New York. This presentation was requested by the ISSOE Team Leader for that center. The session primarily involved Institute staff explaining the purposes of the field test. All four of the teachers who attended the presentation were interested in participating in the field test this year. Institute staff explained that it would, most likely, be impossible for them to participate this year but their request would be kept in mind in planning for Phase II activities.

May 21, 1980:

Institute staff visited the Coopers Career Center/Steuben-Allegheny BOCES and found that all field test activities had been going as planned and were on schedule. The teachers indicated that they would be pleased to meet with Institute staff during the summer to plan the field test for next fall. They felt that during the summer they would be more capable of indicating exactly which competencies each student had completed. They requested that Institute staff return to the Center on June 16 to update the wall chart, and then return on June 18 with a final RAOPP for each student. After that

meeting, Institute staff visited the Broome-Tioga BOCES and updated CIOE's wall charts to coincide with the charts used by the teacher. The teacher indicated that she would complete all of the RAOPPs for her students and would prepare additional copies to be mailed to CIOE. She indicated that the majority of her students would be leaving the BOCES within the next week, and doubted whether Institute staff would have the opportunity to complete verification of utility questionnaires with the students. She stated that she would be pleased to meet with Institute staff during the summer to plan for the 1980-81 field test.

May 22, 1980:

Institute staff met with three of the field test teachers in the Syracuse City Schools. The first teacher was given the first copy of the RAOPPs for her students. These were explained to the teachers and the students by CIOE staff. The second teacher that the staff visited also had the RAOPPs distributed to her class and explained; the third teacher had similar experiences with Institute staff on that day.

June 10, 1980:

Final RAOPPs were returned to all Syracuse City Schools field test sites.

June 13, 1980:

Final RAOPPs were returned to all students at the Rochester field test site.

June 16, 1980:

Institute staff traveled to the Coopers Career Center/Steuben-Alleghany BOCES to collect final data from the wall charts for the teachers as per their request. However, the BOCES was closed that day. No teachers or students were present and no alternative date was set for the gathering of this data. No visit was made to this site on June 18.

From June 16, 1980 through July 31, 1980 Institute staff activities related to the Field Test centered on three main areas. As soon as the field test was completed, efforts were undertaken to summarize the verification of utility questionnaires. The results of those questionnaires are included in the next section of this report. Subsequent to the questionnaire evaluation, Phase I field test activities were evaluated. This involved an analysis of all IEP options, a review of the strategies used to recruit and implement the field test sites, and an analysis of the user's guides. Finally, efforts were extended for preparation of fall field test activities.

Activities for August and September primarily centered around negotiations for test sites for the Phase II Field Test. Minimal contacts were established with new field test participants and efforts were undertaken to secure copies of the ISSOE catalogs for the program areas that would be involved in fall field testing. On September 16, 1980 a presentation of the Phase I and Phase II activities was made at the ISSOE Regional Coordinators Conference held in Albany. At that time site finalization was achieved; individual site negotiations were then able to proceed. Following the September 16th presentation, Institute staff primarily concentrated their efforts on making final modifications to forms and guides in preparation for fall and spring field testing.

Activities for October involved indentification of the sites, teachers, students and program areas which would be used in the test. Contacts were established with all Regional Coordinators involved in the field test and visits to each Regional Coordinator, and many of the sites, occurred. No classroom activities transpired during the month of October, since forms and guides had not yet been finalized.

Activities for November involved the establishment (recruitment, confirmation and implementation) of some field test sites. Procedures were similar to those used in the early phases of this field test. A more detailed accounting of the day by day field test

activities related to each individual site, the Regional Coordinator, teachers and students will be explained in the Phase II Final Report.

The activities for December involved the final preparation of the Phase I Final Report. No actual contacts with the field were initiated during December using Phase I funds.

Verification of Utility Questionnaires. As a means of verifying the utility or value of the field test, Institute staff developed evaluation questionnaires to be administered by CIOE staff to students and teachers who participated in the field test. Copies of these evaluation questionnaires are included in this report as Appendices C, D, and E. Two separate evaluation questionnaires were completed for students. One (Appendix C) was developed for freshmen, sophomores and juniors who participated in the field test. The other (Appendix D) was for seniors participating in the field test. Essentially, the two questionnaires were identical with the exception of questions related to the value of field test materials in future educational or employment activities.

Many of the students who participated in the field test did not complete evaluation questionnaires. There were a variety of reasons for this omission. At one site, the students had left the BOCES prior to the finalization of the questionnaires. At a second site, on the date that the questionnaires were to be administered the site was closed. At a third site, on the date that the questionnaires were to be administered over 90% of the students were absent since it was the last day of classes. At the final site, questionnaires were completed on all students who attended school on that day. Although over 200 students participated in the field test, only 32 questionnaires were completed (17 freshmen, sophomores and juniors, and 15 seniors).

Table 1 indicates the frequency of responses for the responses for the freshmen, sophomore and junior questionnaire. Table 2 indicates the frequency of responses for the senior questionnaire.

Regarding the questionnaire administered to freshmen, sophomores and juniors, it should be noted that the students overwhelmingly felt that the IEP sections which they completed (Student Program Planning Information and the actual IEP itself) were of great assistance to them and, they felt, would be of great assistance to other occupational education students. The Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile also was seen as valuable by the students in understanding their training, although it frequently was not used in planning their occupational education program. It might also be noted that 16 of the 17 students who completed this questionnaire indicated that they would use the Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile in a job search in the future (Question 25). Finally, it should be noted that: (A) over 85% of the students indicated that they felt an employer would both understand and want to use the Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile when considering a person for a job; (B) that the RAOPP would help them get a job; and (C) would provide information that an employer would desire. Regarding the senior questionnaire (Table 2), nearly identical results were discovered.

Thirteen teachers participated in the field test. Most of the teachers preferred not to complete formal project evaluation questionnaire (Appendix E), but preferred to discuss project strengths and weakness with project staff on an informal basis. Their discussions were both valuable and positive. Three teachers did complete the questionnaires (Table 3) and returned them to CIOE. The results are supportative of the field test, field test materials and technical assistance related to the field test.

Table 1

Evaluation Questionnaire - Freshman, Sophomore and Junior Form

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
1. How much did the SPPI help you plan your occupational education program for the past two months of school?	1	12	4
2. How much did the SPPI help you decide what career you wanted to follow?	2	9	6
3. How much did the SPPI help you decide what specific jobs you might want?	6	7	4
4. Did your occupational teacher structure your program to fit the jobs you marked on the SPPI that you would like to do?	4	10	3
5. Did your SPPI help you in planning what to do after your training ends?	2	11	3
6. Do you feel the SPPI would help other students in planning their occupational education program?	14	3	0
7. Did you use your IEP to plan what you would study in your occupational education program this month or so?	0	9	6
8. Did the IEP help you to judge how well you were doing in your occupational education program?	9	5	1
9. Did your occupational education teacher use the IEP to decide what training you would receive in your occupational education program?	1	6	8
10. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what career you wanted?	2	9	6
11. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what specific jobs you might want?	4	8	3
12. How much did the IEP help you to know there were "gaps" in your training?	13	0	2

Table 1 - contd.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
13. *Did the IEP help you better know what you needed to learn during the past few months?*	11	2	1
14. *Do you think the IEP could help you plan what you need to learn next year?*	12	1	1
15. *Could the IEP help other students to plan their occupational education programs?*	13	1	1
16. *Did you understand what the IEP folder was being used for?*	8	5	2
17. *Did you "use" the folder for record keeping, planning, etc., other than simply filling the form out at the beginning of the study?*	3	7	5
18. *Did the RAOPP help you know how well you were progressing toward your occupational goals?*	8	7	1
19. *Did the RAOPP help you to judge how well you were doing in your training?*	12	6	0
20. *Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program during this past year?*	1	5	12
21. *Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program for the next school year?*	3	4	11
22. *Did the information which you got from the RAOPP make you feel that you had made the right choice to study for this particular occupation?*	8	10	0
23. *Do you think that the RAOPP will help other students in the future in their occupational education programs?*	14	3	0

Table 2

Evaluation Questionnaire - Senior Form

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
1. *How much did the SPPI help you plan your occupational education program for the last two months of school?*	2	10	3
2. *How much did the SPPI help you decide what career you wanted to follow?*	1	9	4
3. *How much did the SPPI help you decide what specific jobs you might want?*	7	4	3
4. *Did your occupational teacher structure your program to fit the jobs you marked on the SPPI that you would like to do?*	6	4	4
5. *Did your SPPI help you in planning what to do after your training ends?*	3	7	4
6. *Do you feel the SPPI would help other students in planning their occupational education program?*	10	3	1
7. *Did you use your IEP to plan what you would study in your occupational education program this month or so?*	1	4	8
8. *Did the IEP help you to judge how well you were doing in your occupational education program?*	5	8	0
9. *Did your occupational education teacher use the IEP to decide what training you would receive in your occupational education program?*	1	6	6
10. *How much did the IEP help you in deciding what career you wanted?*	2	8	3
11. *How much did the IEP help you in deciding what specific jobs you might want?*	4	5	4

Table 2 - contd.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
12. How much did the IEP help you to know that there were "gaps" in your training?	10	2	1
13. Did the IEP help you know better what you needed to learn during the year?	6	6	1
14. How much would you say the IEP might help other students to plan their occupational education programs?	10	3	0
15. Did you understand what the IEP folder was being used for?	7	5	0
16. Did you "use" the folder for record keeping, planning, etc, other than simply filling the form out at the beginning of the study?	1	5	7
17. Did the RAOPP help you know how well you were progressing toward your occupational goals?	10	5	1
18. Did the RAOPP help you to judge how well you were doing in your training?	9	6	0
19. Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program during this past year?	3	6	8
20. Did the information which you got from the RAOPP make you feel that you had made the right choice to study for this particular occupation?	5	7	3
21. Do you think that the RAOPP will help other students in the future in their occupational education programs?	11	4	1

Table 2 - contd.

22. *Do you have a job now, or have a job lined up for after you graduate? Check all answers that are true for you.*

3	a.	*YES, I have a job in my training area. I am working at it now, and will continue to work at it.*
6	b.	*YES, I have a job now, but it is not in my occupational training area.*
1	c.	*YES, I have a job in my training area lined up for after graduation. I haven't started it yet.*
0	d.	*YES, I have a job lined up for after graduation. I haven't started it yet and it is not in my occupational training area.*
6	e.	*NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up, but I am looking for one.*
3	f.	*NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up, and I don't intend to look for one.*
1	g.	*Other plans—describe them.* _____

23. *Is the RAOPP something you have shown or intend to show to an employer in job hunting? Check only one answer below.*

0	a.	*YES, I have used it in job hunting and intend to use it in the future for other jobs.*
11	b.	*NO, I haven't used it yet, but I would like to use it for job hunting in the future.*
0	c.	*YES, I have used it in job hunting, but don't intend to use it again.*
3	d.	*NO, I haven't used it in job hunting and don't want to use it.*

TABLE 2 - contd.

24. *Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle one answer at the right for each statement.*

	AGREE	DISAGREE
a. *Most employers would not want to see an RAOPP in considering a person for a job.*	2	13
b. *Most employers would not understand an RAOPP or how to use it to judge a person.*	2	13
c. *I would rather just talk to an employer about my job skills and not show him/her my RAOPP.*	5	10
d. *I think that using the RAOPP is a good idea since it lets an employer know what I can do.*	14	1
e. *My RAOPP probably wouldn't help me get a job.*	3	12

25. *Have you shown your RAOPP to the following people? Circle one answer at the right for each.*

	YES	NO
a. *Your parents*	5	9
b. *Your main occupational teacher*	10	2
c. *Other teachers*	1	13
d. *Guidance counselor(s)*	0	14
e. *Potential employers*	10	4

Table 3

Evaluation Questionnaire - Teacher Form

1. *(Asked teachers how many pupils were in their classes.)*

2. *Usefulness of SPPI/TPW*	*Very useful*	*Somewhat useful*	*Not useful*
a. *Counseling students in their career choice*	2	1	0
b. *Counseling students on their occupational education studies*	2	1	0
c. *Counseling students on their academic career*	1	1	0
d. *Planning what occupational tasks individual students should learn during the school year*	3	0	0
e. *Planning instruction for the class as a whole*	2	1	0
f. *Understanding student interests and abilities*	2	1	0
g. *Judging student work and progress*	3	0	0
h. *Sequencing instruction in the classes*	3	0	0

3. *How useful would you judge that Form I was to the students in your classes in doing the following? Circle your answers at the right.*

	Very useful	*Somewhat useful*	*Not useful*
a. *Confirming their career choice*	1	2	0
b. *Planning their occupational education studies*	3	0	0
c. *Judging their work and progress*	3	0	0
d. *Thinking about specific jobs they might want*	3	0	0
e. *Getting counseling and advice*	1	2	0
f. *Understanding students' interests and abilities*	2	1	0

Table 3 - contd.

4. *Was Form 1 easy for you to understand and use? Check one answer.*

   3 a. *YES, it was easy.*

   0 b. *YES, but it took me a while to figure it out.*

   0 c. *NO, it was hard for me to understand it.*

5. *Do you feel that Form 1 was easy for your students to understand and use? Check one answer.*

   2 a. *YES, it was easy for most of them.*

   1 b. *YES, but it took most of them a while to figure it out.*

   0 c. *NO, it was always hard for most of them to understand.*

6. *How useful do you think that Form 1 would be to other occupational or "academic" teachers in planning instruction? Check one.*

	Occupational		Academic	
3	a.	*Very useful*	2	a. *Very useful*
0	b.	*Somewhat useful*	1	b. *Somewhat useful*
0	c.	*Not useful*	0	c. *Not useful*

7. *How useful do you think that Form 1 would be to future students in planning their occupational education programs?*

   2 a. *Very useful*

   1 b. *Somewhat useful*

   0 c. *Not useful*

8. *What changes would you recommend making to Form 1 to make it more useful to teachers or student in the future?*

   None listed.

Table 3 - contd.

9. *How useful was the RAOPP to you in doing each of the following? Circle one answer at the right for each activity.*

		Very useful	*Somewhat useful*	*Not useful*
a.	*Planning instruction to fit individual students' needs*	2	1	0
b.	*Planning what to teach my classes as a whole*	2	1	0
c.	*Planning your sequence of instruction*	3	0	0
d.	*Discovering what job skills students lacked or needed to learn*	3	0	0
e.	*Managing classroom instruction*	3	0	0

10. *How useful was the RAOPP to your students in doing each of the following? Circle one answer at the right.*

		Very useful	*Somewhat useful*	*Not useful*
a.	*Judging their progress toward their occupational goals*	2	1	0
b.	*Confirming their career choice*	1	2	0
c.	*Motivating students to learn*	1	2	0

11. *Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle one answer at the right for each statement.*

		AGREE	*DISAGREE*
a.	*Most employers would not like to see an RAOPP in considering a job applicant.*	1	2
b.	*Most employers would not understand an RAOPP or know how to use it.*	0	3
c.	*Most students would rather just talk to an employer about their skills than show him or her their RAOPP.*	0	3
d.	*Using the RAOPP is a good idea for a job applicant since it lets a potential employer know exactly what a person can do.*	3	0

Table 3 - contd.

12. *Do you know of any students in your class(es) who actually showed their RAOPP to potential employers in an effort to get a full- or a part-time job?*

   0 a. *YES, I know of about ___ student(s) who did this. (Write an estimated number in the blank.)*

   2 b. *NO, I don't know of any who did this.*

13. *Do you have any students in your field test class(es) who will return to you next year? Check one.*

   3 a. *YES*

   0 b. *NO*

   If YES, will you use the RAOPP to plan occupational education programs for these students for next year?

   2 a. *YES, with all returning students*

   0 b. *YES, with most returning students*

   1 c. *YES, with some returning students*

   0 d. *NO, won't use it in planning for any students for next year*

14. *What changes to the RAOPP would you recommend making in order to make it more useful to teachers, students, or potential employers in the future?*

   None listed.

Table 3 - contd.

Class Progress Charts

15. *How useful did you find these wall charts to be in doing the following activities? Circle one answer at the right for each activity.*

		Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a.	*Planning instruction for the class*	1	1	1
b.	*Evaluating instruction for the class*	1	2	0
c.	*Determining what tasks students had missed*	0	2	1
d.	*Determining what tasks needed to be taught*	0	2	1
e.	*Reporting class progress to the administration*	3	0	0
f.	*Deciding what resources are needed to teach the program*	3	0	0
g.	*Determining needs for teacher in-service training*	3	0	0
h.	*Suggesting modifications to your occupational education program*	1	1	1
i.	*Motivating students who were falling behind*	1	1	1

16. *Would you recommend using the Class Progress Charts again in the future?*

0 a. *NO*

3 b. *YES, with little or no change*

0 c. *YES, but with the following changes*

In-Service Training and Staff Development

17. *The Cornell University researchers associated with the field test of the ISSOE materials conducted some in-service/staff development sessions. Rate these researchers on the following characteristics. Circle your answers at the right.*

Table 3 - contd.

Were they. . .	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all
a. Courteous?	3	0	0
b. Punctual?	3	0	0
c. Accessible to you for your questions?	3	0	0
d. Knowledgeable about their subject?	3	0	0
e. Cooperative with your teaching effort?	3	0	0
f. Helpful to you?	3	0	0
g. Conscious of your local needs?	3	0	0
h. Good presenters at the sessions?	3	0	0
i. Careful to ask for and use your ideas?	3	0	0
j. Able to explain the ISSOE system clearly?	3	0	0

18. Was the assistance they gave to you sufficient for your needs?

3 a. YES

0 b. NO

19. How could you have obtained more or better information from them?

None listed

Table 3 - contd.

The ISSOE Manuals

20. *There are 5 ISSOE manuals which explain the background of the system and how to use it. How much of each of these 5 manuals did you read? Circle one answer at the right for each.*

Manuals	*All of it*	*Parts of it*	*None of it*
a. *Systems Overview*	*1*	*1*	*1*
b. *Student Decision Making*	*2*	*1*	*0*
c. *Planning Student Programs*	*1*	*1*	*1*
d. *Reporting Student Progress*	*1*	*1*	*1*
e. *Developing Student Profiles*	*1*	*1*	*1*

21. *How could the manuals be made more useful to you and to other teachers in the future?*

Manuals were excellent.

22. *How useful were each of the manuals to you in your use of ISSOE? Circle one answer at the right for each?*

Manuals	*Very useful*	*Somewhat useful*	*Not useful*
a. *Systems Overview*	*2*	*1*	*0*
b. *Student Decision-Making*	*3*	*0*	*0*
c. *Planning Student Programs*	*3*	*0*	*0*
d. *Reporting Student Progress*	*2*	*1*	*0*
e. *Developing Student Profiles*	*2*	*1*	*0*

Table 3 - contd.

23. *If you read parts of any manual (Question 19), please check below those parts which you read.*

Systems Overview

2	a.	*Introduction*
2	b.	*Overview of ISSOE*
3	c.	*The Management of Student Progress*
2	d.	*Dissemination and Implementation*
3	e.	*Management Information*

Student Decision Making

3	a.	*Introduction*
2	b.	*Career Guidance in ISSOE: Where It Fits in*
3	c.	*Models for Decision-Making*
2	d.	*Supplemental Materials for Career Decision-Making*

Planning Student Programs

2	a.	*Introduction*
1	b.	*What is Individualized Education?*
2	c.	*Advantages of a Individualized Program*
2	d.	*Theoretical Approaches to Individualization*
2	e.	*Practical Applications of Individualized Programs*
1	f.	*Adapting Competency-Based Vocational Educational Materials Into An Individualized Format: A Guide to ISSOE Materials*

Reporting Student Progress

2	a.	*Introduction*
2	b.	*Data Collection Options*
2	c.	*Data Collection Schedule*
2	d.	*Data Collection Office and Submission Options*
1	e.	*Data Processing Options*
1	f.	*Procedures for Making Corrections*
1	g.	*If problems Develop. . .*

Developing Student Profiles

2	a.	*Introduction*
1	b.	*Value of ISSOE Student Employability Profile*
2	c.	*Reporting Formats and Instructions*
1	d.	*Distribution Plan*

Project Dissemination and Diffusion Activities

Since project dissemination and diffusion activities were classified as among the objectives of the proposal, they are included in this section rather than in a separate section dealing with this topic as requested in the guidelines of the New York State Education Department, Bureau of Occupational Education Research. It is felt that including this information here is more valuable than placing it in a different portion of the report, since this method clearly identifies the activities for each objective.

Activities related to the dissemination of this project's findings and results progressed through a variety of techniques. Although requests had been made to disseminate project activities, findings and results at national conferences, this was not approved by the State Education Department. Therefore, all dissemination and diffusion activities involved in-state presentations only. It should be noted, however, that although only a handful of formal presentations were made related to the Field Test, numerous informal contacts were established and maintained during the project. These contacts involved meetings or phone conversations with Area Facilitators, Regional Coordinators, Directors of Occupational Education, ISSOE Team Leaders and others involved in occupational education in New York State. Formal presentations related to the dissemination and diffusion of project activities occurred at the following times and locations.

March 25, 1980:

A presentation on field test activities was made by Drs. James Dunn and Robert Frank at Riverhead, New York. The meeting was held to highlight a number of management issues which local administrators and support staff may have to consider as they implement ISSOE in classes and schools. The persons attending that conference primarily consisted

of administrators from the Suffolk BOCES 1, 2, and 3. Approximately 30 people attended.

May 31, 1980:

A presentation was made to the ISSOE Area A Automotive Mechanics teachers. This workshop was held at the Old Westbury Campus of the New York Institute of Technology on Long Island and was sponsored by the ISSOE Area A Facilitator. Approximately 40 people attended, all of whom were automotive instructors or first line administrators in the occupational education system.

June 5, 1980:

A presentation of the field test was made to the ISSOE staff of the New York State Education Department. The presentation was made by Drs. James Dunn and Robert Frank. Approximately six people attended.

September 16, 1980:

A presentation on the field test was made at the ISSOE Regional Coordinator's Conference in Albany, New York. Approximately 30 people including all ISSOE Regional Coordinators, Area Facilitators and many representatives of bureaus from the New York State Education Department, attended the session.

November 2, 1980:

A presentation on the field test was made at the New York State Occupational Education Association (NYSOEA) Conference in Albany, New York. Approximately 30 persons attended this session.

December 15, 1980:

A presentation on the field test was made at the ISSOE Regional Coordinator's Conference in Albany, New York. Approximately 25 persons attended including several bureau representatives of SED.

As mentioned previously, other attempts were made to prepare either presentations or articles based upon the procedures and results of the CIOE/ISSOE Field Test. However, each time these requests were submitted to the State Education Department for approval, the proposal or article was denied. Therefore, large scale and broad-based dissemination activities were greatly minimized.

PART III
PROJECT EVALUATION

Project evaluation has been approached through a variety of techniques, some of which are highly subjective. There were no formal, written evaluations of project success, although requests by additional persons to participate in the field test imply success. That is, numerous persons who were not initially involved requested, as the field test progressed, to "come aboard." Based upon the large number of requests, it became evident that persons in the field were willing, able and eager to join the CIOE/ISSOE field test. Therefore, as one means of evaluation, these requests to join imply success.

A second means of project evaluation came about through the verification of utility questionnaires that were explained previously. These surveys clearly support Phase I field test activities.

A third area of evaluation of project activities was derived through the Institute ISSOE Coordinating Committee. That committee, consisting of Research Associates and Assistants involved in ISSOE, met regularly through out the term of the project and evaluated the progress of the project activities. It was felt by all members of the Coordinating Committee that work proceded smoothly, on schedule and met the needs of the persons in the field.

Finally, evaluation was obtained from persons at the State Education Department. Again, although no written, formal evaluations were obtained. the verbal and informal project evaluations and responses to project status reports indicated that these individuals perceived the project as moving both smoothly and successfully.

Formal evaluations were not included as part of the project design and were, therefore, not planned. Similarly, it would have been difficult to evaluate the project through a formal and written document. In a situation such as this where the activities which the project was attempting to accomplish involve the field testing of forms and procedures, the objectives are probably more successfully evaluated through the informal conversations and correspondence which the Project Director and Principal Investigator received, than through any type of formal, written evaluation. We therefore place a high value on these oral and informal comments, and regard them as the true means of evaluating project effectiveness.

PART IV
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are many things which one could conclude and recommend as a result of this Field Test. One could generate many options to be pursued by the State Education Department and the Cornell Institute for Occupational Education, for improving the field test as designed in Phase I and preparing future field testing activities. However, one must keep in mind the nature of the field test participants, and the confines of the administrative structures of both SED and CIOE. These factors must be considered in order to make conclusions and recommendations which are most beneficial to those persons involved in the daily management of ISSOE in New York State.

Recommendation 1

The field test should be expanded to include as many and as diverse regions, teachers and programs as is possible, in order to examine the adaptability of the support materials to a variety of configurations.

Recommendation 2

The field test needs to be more responsive to requests from local teachers, administrators and ISSOE Regional Coordinators for providing inservice and technical assistance to persons in the field.

Recommendation 3

The Individual Education Plan forms and Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile forms need to be modified in order to make them more generic to occupational education, and less specific to each individual program.

Recommendation 4

Machine support for the ISSOE system is essential to ensuring its continued success and acceptance. During the Phase I field test the bulk of data collection and analysis was performed manually. Although manual operations could be continued and greatly expanded, it is a severe limitation if one were to consider implementing and monitoring ISSOE, on a statewide basis. It is essential that some of the forms and procedures be machine assisted.

Recommendation 5

ISSOE catalogs and forms need to be prepared and distributed prior to the beginning of classes in the fall. Extensive time and efforts are required when mid-year changes are necessary. It would greatly facilitate implementation if the teachers had the requisite materials before the semester began.

The above stated recommendations are those deemed to be most important and beneficial to the continued success and acceptance of ISSOE and CIOE support materials in New York State.

In conclusion, it should be noted that although the field test only operated for 6 months (four in the spring and two months in the fall of 1980), the results of the field test activities were deemed by all involved to be successful and beneficial.

PART V
APPENDICES

A. Minutes of ISSOE Meeting, January 29, 1980

B. Minutes of ISSOE Meeting, April 24, 1980

C. Verification of Utility Questionnaire - Freshman, Sophomores and Juniors

D. Verification of Utility Questionnaire - Seniors

E. Verification of Utility Questionnaire - Teachers

APPENDIX A

ISSOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

January 29, 1980

Taylor Room - Statler Inn

Present:	J. Dunn	P. Cooke
	R. Frank	D. Adamson
	D. Ridley	J. Cheney
	P. Gray	J. Lahren
	A. Edsall	T. Reilly
	C. Walker	J. Penrose
	C. Liu	

Guests: Roger Matthews, Carla Zangrelli

The meeting was convened at 10:35 a.m. by J. Dunn with an introduction of those in attendance and welcoming all, commenting that the goal of the meeting was increased dialogue between area facilitators, regional coordinators, researchers, and data processors.

Status of Projects

D. Ridley gave an updated report on Dissemination. Implications of Phase I of Literature review, consulting with outside experts and the need to identify and understand the key people who will be adopting and working with the dissemination system were discussed.

Objectives of Phase II, identifying roles, problems and concerns, validation of the same, and identifying methods of cost-estimation were discussed. It had been decided that there was too much variation in local areas to be able to do an adequate job of cost estimation as yet. Later, questions were raised about this, primarily because this is what local officials want to know.

Instruments for validation were presented to the group and discussed (see Appendix A). Samples of letters, questionnaires, etc. were passed around and commented on. They are in the process of being implemented.

It is necessary to revise the Phase III proposal as originally drafted by Vern Beuke. That phase will attempt to identify characteristics associated with adoption implementation. One of the research questions for Phase III was related to evaluation of students' satisfaction in occupational education. This was discussed. Also, how dissemination can be better articulated with other efforts around the state was discussed. J. Lahren made the comment that no implementation was being done in Region 12. D. Ridley said that a random sample could not be taken around the state, because active ISSOE sites were too scattered.

The crux of the problem is: Is ISSOE a real Instructional Support System or an inservice teacher-development project? Are teachers really using it or are they just in for the money? Is something really happening in the classroom? Cost-effectiveness is a problem. ISSOE effectiveness should be validated through questionnaires to students, occupational education directors, counselors in the field test. We need to find those teachers that are actually using ISSOE out of those teachers that are supposed to be involved. J. Lahren said he could give a list of ISSOE staff taking it for college credit, etc. This could be used in field test if desired. Fifty teachers in 4 regions would be needed.

A difference in the comprehension of ISSOE came out in the meetings. Some saw it as competency-based material with instruction as an offshoot. Others saw the whole package, others different yet.

The importance of getting students' impressions at this point was discussed. Some thought it would be good to get the impressions of those students that are implementing ISSOE only, others thought it was too soon to get and impressions. At some point it has to be done. The idea of getting similar impressions from employers was brought up also. This was received with interest.

The thought was expressed frequently throughout the meeting that the teachers who actually use ISSOE, not just are involved with it, should be identified. J. Cheney brought out that there are many really good teachers who use individualized instruction and all that goes with it, but will have nothing to do with ISSOE for one reason or another. Some are afraid of the paper work of ISSOE thinking it is a new system from what they are using, when it really would not be that much of a change from what they are doing now.

T. Reilly suggested looking at the differences between ISSOE and non-ISSOE teachers. What makes an ISSOE teacher--the specific characteristics.

T. Reilly asked why cost-estimates cannot be done now. Local people are looking for at least some tentative idea as to the cost of implementation. D. Ridley stated that fixing cost values would be premature because of such wide variation across the state. J. Dunn suggested that it might be important to establish cost by specific instructional or implementation areas. What is a higher cost area in one region might not be for another. J. Lahren made comment that many schools are developing their own system and it's working for them. They don't care what is going on in the rest of the state. They don't want to invest a lot of money in instructional material or computer setup if it's not going to meet needs.

Methods of dissemination were discussed. An ISSOE leaflet has been developed, revised and is being printed. Also, a slide presentation of ISSOE is developed and B. Frank asked if there was something that we could do to help with this. C. Zangrelli was responsible for the assembling of this presentation. Peter Cooke said they would let this idea

ride as is for the time being as a quick overview of ISSOE. Other things could be added to it later as new components are developed. J. Dunn was concerned as to the consistency of what ISSOE is as far as presentations are concerned.

R. Frank gave a summary of the Instructional Planning area of ISSOE. Comments were made on development of IEP's and other forms, and that different forms and materials will work better with some competencies and some students than with others. A literature review was done on how people evaluate instructional material. There was no model except in a decision-making framework. We had to develop a model. Now the goal is to have workshops at 2 sites--(1 auto and 1 business, 1 rural and 1 urban), to teach teachers how to evaluate material in various areas. Funds are available to provide 3 sets of materials which teachers would evaluate and eventually would become part of the Area Facilitator resource centers. Another goal is to develop a sheet for teachers to use for evaluating instructional materials. These sheets could go into binders. These sheets will cover different types of material--books, filmstrips, etc.--and different types of learners--slow, handicapped, rural, etc. Forms will evaluate different kinds of things such as sex bias, ethnic bias.

J. Penrose is trying to develop a slide-tape presentation on how to use material to provide enrichment. She wants to collect examples of materials teachers have used. She wants to compare notes to see if what SED, CIOE and others are doing are compatible. R. Frank asks that others get to him lists of materials or textbooks, filmstrips, etc. that could be tried out. It should be material they don't already have in their libraries, would like and could use.

Workshops--no pay will be involved, only voluntary participation. First one will be a two day workshop with several followups. How to lure teachers to cooperate? J. Lahren says teachers from Region 12 can only come on evenings or weekends as there are no substitutes for teachers to take off days. R. Frank stated he would work with the teachers whenever they are available.

Afternoon session
(Continuation of Instructional Planning Discussions)

Field test would involve testing models of instructional material evaluation, steps to evaluate instructional material, form to report evaluations on, and the IEPs.

Would need 25-50 teachers per site in business and/or automotive. No pay given, no college credit. Just good experience. The concept of IEP is not being tested, just the form. The concept has been tested, and is now mandated in areas of handicapped and in some schools all over the state.

As to sites Doug Adamson suggested an area with a concentration of teachers such as Nassau or Long Island be used. J. Penrose suggested New York City. P. Cooke suggested that you want people that are interested, conveniently located with both rural and urban areas. Try Rochester of Syracuse. R. Frank suggested that it would be better in New York City because other ISSOE projects are already being tested in Rochester and other areas. J. Penrose suggeste her area near Long Island. J. Cheney was concerned about a disturbance in his area in business education and wondered if that subject area should be used. A suggestion was made to concentrate on one or two subjects of automotive where there are no disturbances.

When asked about the time line on testing, R. Frank stated IEP testing must be done during school year, evaluation of instructional materials could be done any time.

Managing Student Learning--in addition to the IEP, the reporting system also will be tested. It has to be practical for teachers to use. LEA's must be able to bend it to meet their needs. Also all procedures have to be machine compatible. They have put everything together that LEA's say they want, but the question remaining is will it be used? Planned are 5-6 sites with modest teacher participation, with five configurations of testing: local manual, local machine, area computer, etc.

Programs can be planned around modules, D.O.T.'s or teacher developing his/her own program his/her own way. A brief description of the IEP folder, and the Individual Student packet forms showing competencies, grades, etc. to serve as a record of completion utilized by the learner, parent, employer was given. Students can be graded or not. Competencies can be added as accomplished, even after school is over and the student has left the program (such as from experience gained on jobs, etc.). These can be recorded and would stay with the student as a part of his/her permanent record. These records can be sent to employer via the student or via the school.

Translating the competency accomplishment to letter grade or number grade has to be a teacher judgment. Some Voc. Ed. teachers are not allowed to assign a grade. The home school does this.

A question was raised as to the employee characteristics noted on the forms. The school situation is different from employment situation and it would be difficult to judge a student for employment on school characteristics. But employers agree these are important. Employers had asked for this information whether it is called employee characteristic, employability characteristic or student characteristic.

ISSOE booklets (User's Guides for the field test) should be out in final form this week. They will be color coded rather than numbered.

Sites for field tests:

Region 11 - Steuben-Allegany-Chemung, etc.
7 - Utica
8 - Broome
10 - Rochester
9 - Onondaga
9 - Syracuse

Question: How much involvement in implementation would regional coordinators have? Some would want to be involved as much as possible for image sake. They could be technical assistance person. Directors may prefer to take the leadership in the technical areas. Some coordinators may not care to be too involved.

It was felt that better communication is needed between SED, the Regional Coordinators, Area Facilitators and CIOE. Several comments were made concerning this. Sixteen reporting forms were developed by T. Reilly based on ISSOE which needed to be investigated by CIOE. J. Cheney would like to be involved in things at a point before printing. T. Reilly stated that Onondaga has no plans for being involved in the ISSOE field testing this year. He also indicated that they (Onondaga) were led to believe by CIOE that this meeting was "critical" and they did not see it as such. They knew previously everything which was discussed.

Question arose as to the original purpose of the meeting: decision-making or informational? If purpose was informational, it was accomplished. D. Adamson stated this group was not a decision-making group because of its size and limited scope, as far as research direction goes. That is to be left to the Steering Committees. This meeting should stimulate ideas and generate enthusiasm for moving things. This was probably accomplished.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

APPENDIX A

for January 29, 1980 meeting

New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
a Statutory College of the State University
Cornell University
Department of Education
Stone Hall
Ithaca, N. Y. 14853

Cornell Institute for
Occupational Education
Telephone 607-256-6515

January 30, 1980

As part of an ongoing State-sponsored research project, we at the Cornell Institute for Occupational Education are trying to learn as much as we can about the variety of participants in ISSOE, their roles, relationships with other roles, and major concerns. The ultimate purpose of this research is to increase the utility and viability of ISSOE.

Of course, the perceptions of individual participants are extremely important to us. Although our staff and resources do not permit us to visit each participant individually, we are trying to do the next best thing. We have interviewed a small number of people, and on the basis of these interviews we have designed a brief questionnaire, which is enclosed. If you will take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope, you will help us to verify and expand the insights already gathered.

We have asked for your name strictly for purposes of identifying who has not responded, but if you wish to remain anonymous, please do not put your name on the form. In any case, your answers will be treated as confidential.

I wish to thank you in advance for your assistance. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to write or call us.

Sincerely,

Dennis R. Ridley
Research Associate

DRR:wkc

P.S. A few of you have already talked with us on an individual basis. We would still like you to complete the questionnaire so we can get as representative a collection of responses as possible. Thank you again.

ISSOE ROLE: AREA FACILITATOR NAME (optional): _____

Background Information

Directions: Please respond to each item.

1. Your position title in addition to Facilitator: _____
2. Years and months as Facilitator: _____
3. Total years and months with ISSOE: _____
4. Percent of full-time spent as Facilitator: _____
5. Role of person who recruited for Facilitator: _____ Dean; _____ SED; _____ Program Chair; Other: (please specify) _____
6. Sex: _____ Female; _____ Male

ISSOE ROLE: AREA FACILITATOR

Activities

Directions: First, considering only the amount of time you spend as Area Facilitator, what percentage of that time (if any) do you spend in the following listed (or closely related) activities?

In the left-hand column under Time, indicate for each activity either "None" or the rough percent of time you spend on it to the nearest 5 percent (for example, 1-5% = 5%; 6-10% = 10%).

Second, in the left-hand column under Rating indicate how important you feel each activity is to your role as Area Facilitator. Use the following scale to rate importance: 1 = unimportant; 2 = slightly important; 3 = moderately important; 4 = highly important; 5 = absolutely essential.

Time (%)	Rating (1-5)	Activities
		Work with Regional Coordinators
____	____	1. Plan and conduct area meetings with Regional Coordinators.
____	____	2. Explain ISSOE procedures to individual Regional Coordinators.
____	____	3. Act as an instructional resource for individual Regional Coordinators.
____	____	4. Participate in state-wide Regional Coordinator Meetings.
		Work with Local Staffs
____	____	5. Plan and conduct presentations on ISSOE in regions during school year.
____	____	6. Plan and conduct summer workshops.
____	____	7. Informal dissemination of information on ISSOE to teachers, students, and others.
____	____	8. Arrange for teacher credit.
____	____	9. Ongoing work with individual staffs.
		Work with SED
____	____	10. Present problems of Regional Coordinators to SED.
____	____	11. Make presentations for SED in Albany.
____	____	12. Prepare annual proposals and budgets.
____	____	13. Edit ISSOE newsletter.
		Other Activities: Please list activities, estimate time and rate importance as above.
____	____	
____	____	

ISSOE ROLE: AREA FACILITATOR

Problems and Concerns

Directions: Here are some typical problems and concerns voiced by Area Facilitators. Please react briefly to each of these.

A. Professional and interpersonal relations with Regional Coordinators.

B. Need for increased contact and response from SED.

C. Professional growth.

D. Need to be kept abreast of current research and development activities that affect ISSOE.

Directions: In the space below, please discuss any problems or concerns you have found that are not listed above.

ISSOE DISSEMINATION--PHASE II: OUTLINE

I. Overall Purpose

II. Planning Phase

- A. Articulation with Phase I
- B. Objectives
  - 1. Identify roles
  - 2. Identify problems and concerns
  - 3. Validate 1 & 2
  - 4. Identify methods of cost-estimation

III. Field-Testing Activities

- A. Field Interviews (completed)
- B. Validation (now in progress)
  - 1. cover letter
  - 2. sample questionnaire
  - 3. other procedures

IV. Time-Line for Completion of Final Report

- A. Draft of Final Report (handout)
- B. Validation
- C. Revise Phase III proposal
- D. Complete Final Report

ISSOE ROLE: OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION
DIRECTORS AND SUPERVISORS

ISSOE Information

Directions: Check the group which has been most helpful in keeping you informed of ISSOE development:

_____ SED _____ CIOE _____ Other (specify):

_____ Regional Coordinators _____ IRDOE _____

_____ Area Facilitators

ISSOE Activities

Directions: Please rate the importance to your role of each ISSOE Activity listed below using the following scale: 1 = Unimportant; 2 = Slightly Important; 3 = Moderately Important; 4 = Highly Important; 5 = Absolutely Essential.

Circle one response at the right for each activity.

Activity	Importance Rating (circle)				
1. Work with local ISSOE Advisory Councils	1	2	3	4	5
2. Organize staff ISSOE development activities . .	1	2	3	4	5
3. Provide ISSOE-related curricular support and guidance.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Review ISSOE and VTECS materials with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Prepare ISSOE budget with SED	1	2	3	4	5
6. Work with ISSOE Regional Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5
7. Other (please specify): _____ _____ . .	1	2	3	4	5

- over please -

ISSOE Problems and Concerns

Directions: Please comment on each of the following problems or concerns voiced by Directors and Supervisors regarding ISSOE:

A. ISSOE implementation (e.g., flexibility, adaptability to certain areas; support materials; need for money):

B. Concern for teachers (e.g., ongoing training; resistance to change; teacher use of curriculum materials):

C. ISSOE materials (e.g., targeted job-level, local validation):

D. Relation with other roles (e.g., SED; Regional Coordinators):

E. Other: Please list and comment on other problems or concerns that you perceive.

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

POINTS OF UNDERSTANDING; ONONDAGA CIOE ISSOE MEETINGS

24 April 1980

Onondaga has only had one person working on the ISSOE Reporting System this year: a computer programmer. At present they can a) put a student in the computer system; and b) prepare a set of standard dummy reports for students for format review.

Onondaga hopes to be able to run fixed standard reports by the beginning of next year; that is, standard format reports for a fixed program model, with no local adaptation or variation, and no cross-program enrollment or scheduling. They hope eventually to be able to do local report adaptations.

There is no provision as yet for instructional materials considerations/recommendations but this is not impossible with this system. Neither would basic skills reporting, i.e., basic skills, competencies reported by task relevant areas be impossible.

To assist Onondaga in programming, CIOE will provide live data for 25 students in the Rochester field test. OERS will provide a core dump on the 25 students. The live data will include system (i.e., ISSOE) requirements, student interests and educational plans, decision rules for developing IEPs, and student competency profiles. Onondaga can thus test the problems of the expansion of the reporting system to meet local needs, conditions and requirements.

Onondaga representatives will be invited to attend any/all subsequent teacher conferences/workshops they may wish to attend. We will continue to keep Onondaga programming staff posted with monthly CIOE progress reports, schedules of meetings and travel, etc.

Onondaga has agreed to provide us regular reports of their progress in software development.

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION (ISSOE)

Evaluation Questionnaire - Freshman, Sophomore and Junior Form

During the past school year, you and your teacher have used ISSOE materials in teaching your occupational education classes. Now, the people who developed these materials are asking for your opinions about these materials. Your answers will help them to improve the materials for other students' use in the future.

This questionnaire is in two parts. Part I is about the Individual Education Plan, or IEP for short. That's the big, stiff paper folder.

Part 2 is about the Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile, called RAOPP for short. That's the packet of pages with the ratings of your ability to perform certain tasks in various job areas.

Answer the questions as directed in each part.

Part 1 - The Individual Education Plan (IEP)

The first part of the IEP that you filled out was the Student Program Planning Information (SPPI) section. Questions 1 to 6 are about the SPPI. Circle the number representing how you feel about each question.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
1. How much did the SPPI help you plan your occupational education program for the past two months of school?.....	3	2	1
2. How much did the SPPI help you decide what career you wanted to follow?.....	3	2	1
3. How much did the SPPI help you decide what specific jobs you might want?.....	3	2	1
4. Did your occupational teacher structure your program to fit the jobs you marked on the SPPI that you would like to do?.....	3	2	1
5. Did your SPPI help you in planning what to do after your training ends?.....	3	2	1
6. Do you feel the SPPI would help other students in planning their occupational education program?	3	2	1

The largest part of the IEP is the "front" side which lists the various objectives and competencies. Questions 7 - 17 are about this part. Circle your answer at the right for each question.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
7. Did you use your IEP to plan what you would study in your occupational education program this month or so?.....	3	2	1
8. Did the IEP help you to judge how well you were doing in your occupational education program?....	3	2	1
9. Did your occupational education teacher use the IEP to decide what training you would receive in your occupational education program?.....	3	2	1
10. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what career you wanted?.....	3	2	1
11. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what specific jobs you might want?.....	3	2	1
12. How much did the IEP help you to know that there were "gaps" in your training?.....	3	2	1
13. Did the IEP help you better know what you needed to learn during the past few months?.....	3	2	1
14. Do you think the IEP could help you plan what you need to learn next year?.....	3	2	1
15. Could the IEP help other students to plan their occupational education programs?.....	3	2	1
16. Did you understand what the IEP folder was being used for?.....	3	2	1
17. Did you "use" the folder for record keeping, planning, etc., other than simply filling the form out at the beginning of the study?.....	3	2	1

Part 2 - Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile (RAOPP)

The other part of the ISSOE materials is the RAOPP. Questions 18 to 28 are about the RAOPP. For questions 18 to 23, circle your answer at the right.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
18. Did the RAOPP help you know how well you were progressing toward your occupational goals?.....	3	2	1

		A lot	Somewhat	Not much
19.	Did the RAOPP help you to judge how well you were doing in your training?.....	3	2	1
20.	Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program during this past year?.....	3	2	1
21.	Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program for the next school year?.....	3	2	1
22.	Did the information which you got from the RAOPP make you feel that you had made the right choice to study for this particular occupation?..	3	2	1
23.	Do you think that the RAOPP will help other students in the future in their occupational education programs?.....	3	2	1

24. Do you have a job now, or have a job lined up for this summer? Check all answers that are true for you.

_____ a. YES, I have a job in my training area. I am working at it now, and will probably continue to work at it.

_____ b. YES, I have a job now, but it is not in my occupational training area.

_____ c. YES, I have a job in my training area lined up for after graduation, but I haven't started yet.

_____ d. YES, I have a job lined up for after graduation. I haven't started it yet. It's not in my occupational training area.

_____ e. NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up, but I am looking for one.

_____ f. NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up and I don't intend to look for one.

_____ g. Other plans--describe them. _____

_____

_____

_____

25. Is the RAOPP something you have shown or intend to show to an employer in your job hunt? Check only one answer below.

_____ a. YES, I have used it in job hunting and intend to use it in the future for other jobs.

_____ b. NO, I haven't used it yet, but I would like to use it for hunting for a job in the future.

_____ c. YES, I have used it in job hunting but don't intend to use it again.

_____ d. NO, I haven't used it in job hunting and don't want to use it.

26. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle one answer at the right for each statement.

a. Most employers would <u>not</u> want to see a RAOPP in considering a person for a job.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
b. Most employers would <u>not</u> understand a RAOPP or how to use it to judge the person.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
c. I would rather just talk to an employer about my job skills and now show him/her my RAOPP..	AGREE	DISAGREE
d. I think that using the RAOPP is a good idea since it lets an employer know exactly what I can do.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
e. My RAOPP probably wouldn't help me get a job.	AGREE	DISAGREE

27. Have you shown your RAOPP to the following people? Circle one answer at the right for each.

a. Your parents.....	YES	NO
b. Your main occupational education teacher.....	YES	NO
c. Other teachers.....	YES	NO
d. Guidance counselor(s).....	YES	NO
e. Potential employers.....	YES	NO
f. Your friends and classmates.....	YES	NO

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION (ISSOE)

Evaluation Questionnaire - Senior Form

During the past school year, you and your teacher have used ISSOE materials in teaching your occupational education classes. Now the people who developed these materials are asking for your opinions about these materials. Your answers will help them to improve the materials for other students to use in the future.

This questionnaire is in two parts. Part 1 is about the Individual Education Plan, or IEP for short. That's the big, stiff paper folder.

Part 2 is about the Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile, called RAOPP for short. That's the packet of pages with the ratings of your ability to perform certain tasks in various job areas.

Answer the questions as directed in each part.

Part 1 - The Individual Education Plan (IEP)

The first part of the IEP that you filled out was the Student Program Planning Information section. Questions 1 to 6 are about the SPPI. Circle your answer at the right for each question.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
1. How much did the SPPI help you plan your occupational education program for the last two months of school?.....	3	2	1
2. How much did the SPPI help you decide what career you wanted to follow?.....	3	2	1
3. How much did the SPPI help you decide what specific jobs you might want?.....	3	2	1
4. Did your occupational teacher structure your program to fit the jobs you marked on the SPPI that you would like to do?.....	3	2	1
5. Did your SPPI help you in planning what to do after your training ends?.....	3	2	1
6. Do you feel the SPPI would help other students in planning their occupational education program?	3	2	1

The largest part of the IEP is the "front" side which lists the various objectives and competencies. Questions 7 to 16 are about this part. Circle your answer at the right for each question.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
7. Did you use your IEP to plan what you would study in your occupational education program this month or so?.....	3	2	1
8. Did the IEP help you to judge how well you were doing in your occupational education program?.....	3	2	1
9. Did your occupational education teacher use the IEP to decide what training you would receive in your occupational education program?.....	3	2	1
10. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what career you wanted?.....	3	2	1
11. How much did the IEP help you in deciding what specific jobs you might want?.....	3	2	1
12. How much did the IEP help you to know that there were "gaps" in your training?.....	3	2	1
13. Did the IEP help you know better what you needed to learn during the year?.....	3	2	1
14. How much would you say the IEP might help other students to plan their occupational education programs?.....	3	2	1
15. Did you understand what the IEP folder was being used for?.....	3	2	1
16. Did you "use" the folder for record keeping, planning, etc., other than simply filling the form out at the beginning of the study?.....	3	2	1

Part 2 - Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile (RAOPP)

The other part of the ISSOE materials is the RAOPP. Questions 17 to 26 are about the RAOPP. For Questions 17 to 21, circle your answer at the right.

	A lot	Somewhat	Not much
17. Did the RAOPP help you know how well you were progressing toward your occupational goals?.....	3	2	1

		A lot	Somewhat	Not much
18.	Did the RAOPP help you to judge how well you were doing in your training?.....	3	2	1
19.	Did you and your teacher use the RAOPP to plan your occupational education program during this past year?.....	3	2	1
20.	Did the information which you got from the RAOPP make you feel that you had made the right choice to study for this particular occupation?.....	3	2	1
21.	Do you think that the RAOPP will help other students in the future in their occupational education programs?.....	3	2	1

22. Do you have a job now, or have a job lined up for after you graduate? Check all answers that are true for you.

_____ a. YES, I have a job in my training area. I am working at it now, and will continue to work at it.

_____ b. YES, I have a job now, but it is not in my occupational training area.

_____ c. YES, I have a job in my training area lined up for after graduation. I haven't started it yet.

_____ d. YES, I have a job lined up for after graduation. I haven't started it yet and it is not in my occupational training area.

_____ e. NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up, but I am looking for one.

_____ f. NO, I don't have a job in my training area lined up and I don't intend to look for one.

_____ f. Other plans--describe them. _____

_____

_____

23. Is the RAOPP something you have shown or intend to show to an employer in your job hunting? Check only one answer below.

_____ a. YES, I have used it in job hunting and intend to use it in the future for other jobs.

_____ b. NO, I haven't used it yet, but I would like to use it for job hunting in the future.

_____ c. YES, I have used it in job hunting, but don't intend to use it again.

_____ d. NO, I haven't used it in job hunting and don't want to use it.

24. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle one answer at the right for each statement.

a. Most employers would not want to see an RAOPP in considering a person for a job.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
b. Most employers would not understand an RAOPP or how to use it to judge a person.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
c. I would rather just talk to an employer about my job skills and not show him/her my RAOPP.	AGREE	DISAGREE
d. I think that using the RAOPP is a good idea since it lets an employer know what I can do.	AGREE	DISAGREE
e. My RAOPP probably wouldn't help me get a job.	AGREE	DISAGREE

25. Have you shown your RAOPP to the following people? Circle one answer at the right for each.

a. Your parents.....	YES	NO
b. Your main occupational teacher.....	YES	NO
c. Other teachers.....	YES	NO
d. Guidance counselor(s).....	YES	NO
e. Potential employers.....	YES	NO
f. Your friends and classmates.....	YES	NO

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION (ISSOE)

Evaluation Questionnaire - Teacher Form

During the past year, you have used ISSOE materials in teaching your occupational education classes. Now the people who developed these materials are asking for your opinions about them. Your answers will help them to improve the materials for other teachers to use in the future.

Form 1 - Student Program Planning Information/Teacher Planning Worksheet/Individual Education Plan

1. How many students are in your occupational education class(es) that participated in the field test?..... _____

2. How useful was Form 1 to you in each of the following? Circle one answer at the right for each activity.

	Activities	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a.	Counseling students in their career choice	3	2	1
b.	Counseling students on their occupational education studies.....	3	2	1
c.	Counseling students on their academic career.....	3	2	1
d.	Planning what occupational tasks individual students should learn during the school year.....	3	2	1
e.	Planning instruction for the class as a whole.....	3	2	1
f.	Understanding student interests and abilities.....	3	2	1
g.	Judging student work and progress.....	3	2	1
h.	Sequencing instruction in the classes.....	3	2	1

3. How useful would you judge that Form 1 was to the students in your classes in doing the following? Circle your answers at the right.

Activities	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a. Confirming their career choice.....	3	2	1
b. Planning their occupational education studies.....	3	2	1
c. Judging their work and progress.....	3	2	1
d. Thinking about specific jobs they might want.....	3	2	1
e. Getting counseling and advice.....	3	2	1
f. Understanding students' interests and abilities.....	3	2	1

4. Was Form 1 easy for you to understand and use? Check one answer.

_____ a. YES, it was easy.

_____ b. YES, but it took me a while to figure it out.

_____ c. NO, it was hard for me to understand it.

5. Do you feel that Form 1 was easy for your students to understand and use? Check one answer.

_____ a. YES, it was easy for most of them.

_____ b. YES, but it took most of them a while to figure it out.

_____ c. NO, it was always hard for most of them to understand.

6. How useful do you think that Form 1 would be to <u>other occupational or "academic" teachers</u> in planning instruction? Check one.

Occupational	Academic
_____ a. Very useful	_____ a. Very useful
_____ b. Somewhat useful	_____ b. Somewhat useful
_____ c. Not useful	_____ c. Not useful

7. How useful do you think that Form 1 would be to future students in planning their occupational education programs?

_____ a. Very useful

_____ b. Somewhat useful

_____ c. Not useful

8. What changes would you recommend making to Form 1 to make it more useful to teachers or students in the future?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Record of Achievement/Occupational Preparation Profile (RAOPP)

9. How useful was the RAOPP to you in doing each of the following? Circle one answer at the right for each activity.

Activities	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a. Planning instruction to fit individual students' needs.....	3	2	1
b. Planning what to teach my classes as a whole.....	3	2	1
c. Planning your sequence of instruction....	3	2	1
d. Discovering what job skills students lacked or needed to learn.....	3	2	1
e. Managing classroom instruction.....	3	2	1

10. How useful was the RAOPP to your students in doing each of the following? Circle one answer at the right.

Activities	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a. Judging their progress toward their occupational goals.....	3	2	1
b. Confirming their career choice.....	3	2	1
c. Motivating students to learn.....	3	2	1

11. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Circle one answer at the right for each statement.

a. Most employers would not like to see an RAOPP in considering a job applicant....	AGREE	DISAGREE
b. Most employers would not understand an RAOPP or know how to use it.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
c. Most students would rather just talk to an employer about their skills than show him or her their RAOPP.....	AGREE	DISAGREE
d. Using the RAOPP is a good idea for a job applicant since it lets a potential employer know exactly what a person can do	AGREE	DISAGREE

12. Do you know of any students in your class(es) who actually showed their RAOPP to potential employers in an effort to get a full- or a part-time job?

_____ a. YES, I know of about _____ student(s) who did this. (Write an estimated number in the blank.)

_____ b. NO, I don't know of any who did this.

13. Do you have any students in your field test class(es) who will return to you next year? Check one.

_____ a. YES

_____ b. NO

If YES, will you use the RAOPP to plan occupational education programs for these students for next year?

_____ a. YES, with all returning students

_____ b. YES, with most returning students

_____ c. YES, with some returning students

_____ d. NO, won't use it in planning for any students for next year

14. What changes to the RAOPP would you recommend making in order to make it more useful to teachers, students, or potential employers in the future?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Class Progress Charts

15. How useful did you find these wall charts to be in doing the following activities? Circle one answer at the right for each activity.

Activities	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a. Planning instruction for the class.....	3	2	1
b. Evaluating instruction for the class.....	3	2	1
c. Determining what tasks students had missed.....	3	2	1
d. Determining what tasks needed to be taught.....	3	2	1
e. Reporting class progress to the administration.....	3	2	1
f. Deciding what resources are needed to teach the program.....	3	2	1
g. Determining needs for teacher in-service training.....	3	2	1
h. Suggesting modifications to your occupational education program.....	3	2	1
i. Motivating students who were falling behind.....	3	2	1

16. Would you recommend using the Class Progress Charts again in the future?

_____ a. NO

_____ b. YES, with little or no change

_____ c. YES, but with the following changes

In-Service Training and Staff Development

17. The Cornell University researchers associated with the field test of the ISSOE materials conducted some in-service/staff development sessions. Rate these researchers on the following characteristics. Circle your answers at the right.

Were they...	Very much	Somewhat	Not at all
a. Courteous?.....	3	2	1
b. Punctual?.....	3	2	1
C. Accessible to you for your questions?.....	3	2	1
d. Knowledgeable about their subject?.....	3	2	1
e. Cooperative with your teaching efforts?...	3	2	1
f. Helpful to you?.....	3	2	1
g. Conscious of your local needs?.....	3	2	1
h. Good presenters at the sessions?.....	3	2	1
i. Careful to ask for and use your ideas?....	3	2	1
j. Able to explain the ISSOE system clearly?.	3	2	1

18. Was the assistance they gave to you sufficient for your needs?

_____ a. YES

_____ b. NO

19. How could you have obtained more or better information from them?

_____

_____

_____

_____

The ISSOE Manuals

20. There are 5 ISSOE manuals which explain the background of the system and how to use it. How much of each of these 5 manuals did you read? Circle one answer at the right for each.

Manuals	All of it	Parts of it	None of it
a. Systems Overview.....	3	2	1
b. Student Decision-Making.....	3	2	1
c. Planning Student Programs.....	3	2	1
d. Reporting Student Progress.....	3	2	1
e. Developing Student Profiles.....	3	2	1

21. How useful were each of the manuals to you in your use of ISSOE? Circle one answer at the right for each.

Manuals	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
a. Systems Overview.....	3	2	1
b. Student Decision-Making.....	3	2	1
c. Planning Student Programs.....	3	2	1
d. Reporting Student Progress.....	3	2	1
e. Developing Student Profiles.....	3	2	1

22. How could the manuals be made more useful to you and to other teachers in the future?

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. If you read parts of any manual (Question 20), please check below those parts which you read.

Systems Overview

_____ a. Introduction
_____ b. Overview of ISSOE
_____ c. The Management of Student Progress
_____ d. Dissemination and Implementation
_____ e. Management Information

Student Decision-Making

_____ a. Introduction
_____ b. Career Guidance in ISSOE: Where It Fits In
_____ c. Models for Decision-Making
_____ d. Supplemental Materials for Career Decision-Making

Planning Student Programs

_____ a. Introduction
_____ b. What is Individualized Education?
_____ c. Advantages of an Individualized Program
_____ d. Theoretical Approaches to Individualization
_____ e. Practical Applications of Individualized Programs
_____ f. Adapting Competency-Based Vocational Educational Materials Into An Individualized Format: A Guide to ISSOE Materials

Reporting Student Progress

_____ a. Introduction
_____ b. Data Collection Options
_____ c. Data Collection Schedule
_____ d. Data Collection Office and Submission Options
_____ e. Data Processing Options
_____ f. Procedures for Making Corrections
_____ g. If Problems Develop...

Developing Student Profiles

_____ a. Introduction
_____ b. Value of ISSOE Student Employability Profile
_____ c. Reporting Formats and Instructions
_____ d. Distribution Plan

INSTITUTE STAFF

James A. Dunn, Director

RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

Vernon Beuke
John Bowers
Mary Margaret Carmichael
Gloria Cooper
Alan Edsall
Robert Frank
Peter Gray
Dennis Ridley
Helen Veres
Clinton Walker

RESEARCH ASSISTANTS

Jeffrey Claus
Philip Harrington
Patricia Kuntz
Elizabeth Martini
Karen Mitchell
Lucy Savitzky
Frances Schorr

SECRETARIAL SUPPORT

Susan Alexander
Sharon Bobnick
Madeline Dean
Elaine LaRocque
Cindy Moore
Judith Nichols
Lois Snyder
Michelle Woodcock

BUSINESS MANAGER

Lynn Rycroft

EDITORS

Doreet Hopp
Eva Kaufman
Johanna Pank